

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Vernon Harrison,)	Case No.: 4:13-cv-01004-TLW
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Stevenson, Warden,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On April 16, 2013, the Petitioner, Vernon Harrison, proceeding *pro se*, filed this Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Doc. #1). Respondent filed a Return and Memorandum and Motion for Summary Judgment on January 23, 2014. (Docs. #21, 22). Petitioner file a timely Response in Opposition. (Doc. #29). This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) filed by Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, to whom this case was previously assigned. (Doc. #31). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court grant the Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment and deny the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus without an evidentiary hearing. (*Id.*). Objections to the Report were due by May 19, 2014. (*See* Doc. #31). No objections were filed.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to

the Report, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

This Court has carefully reviewed the record and the Report. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report, (Doc. #31), is **ACCEPTED**. The Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. #22), is **GRANTED** and the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus, (Doc. #1), is **DENIED** without an evidentiary hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

June 27, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina